

When that occurred, our country was 36-percent dependent on foreign oil. We are 56-percent dependent now. Do you know why? Because in the life of this administration we have had over 30 oil refineries close; we have had leases canceled; we have had no development; and we have had an increasing dependence—not less—on foreign oil. I tell the American people, that is why you are paying too much. That is why you are paying more than you need to, because we are being held hostage to a cartel of foreign nations—many that wish us ill, many that would like to put us over an oil barrel and push us over.

I am saying I don't like drilling for oil. Every one of us drives a car and for a lot of us, the oil that drives that car is refined in Texas. Everyone of us likes the freedom of an automobile. Frankly, I would rather say to the American people: Let your sons and daughters drill for oil so they do not have to die for oil. We are setting them up to die for oil if we do not figure out some better balance between production and conservation.

Conservation is important. I vote for conservation initiatives. But it is not the whole answer. You have to produce something. A third of our trade deficit is due to foreign oil. If you want an independent country, if you want an independent foreign policy, you cannot be totally dependent, as we are becoming, on foreign oil. But there you have it. That has been the policy of this administration.

Finally, our Vice President said he wants to outlaw or get rid of the internal combustion engine. In my neck of the woods, we have the incredible benefit of hydroelectric power. We have low energy rates because of hydroelectric power. But, guess what, they are talking about tearing them down. They want to tear out the most clean, most renewable, most affordable energy supply that we have. Guess what happens when you do that. You lose—the recreation is gone, but, more importantly, you lose the irrigation for farmers, you lose the transportation of goods from the interior all the way from Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon to the Port of Portland and around the Pacific rim. You lose the ability to use this system of locks to move vast quantities of agricultural and other commodities.

I don't think we want to do that. I think it is very unwise. If you want to get rid of the internal combustion engine—let's examine this briefly. Right now, to move about a half a million bushels of grain, you need four barges that move through these locks. Four barges use very little energy. It just floats and makes its way to the Port of Portland. Get rid of the locks or dams, guess what, you have to truck them or rail them. How many railcars does it take to replace the four barges? It takes 140 jumbo railcars to move the same volume.

The tracks, the infrastructure is not there to do all the railing. So then you go to trucks, internal combustion engines. Guess how many trucks it takes: Four barges versus 539 large "semi" trucks. Guess what creates pollution. Guess what creates damage to your roads. That will do it.

I want to be fair about this. When we are becoming so dependent on foreign oil, so dependent upon foreign energy, so dependent as a superpower on others, I think it is very imprudent to begin tearing out our energy infrastructure.

So I will close, and I say again with a heavy heart, I think right now politics is prevailing over good policy. I think that is too bad. But let me tell you, the real losers will be the American people if the Republican majority caves in to the kind of tactics that say if you don't take everything we want we are going to make you look like you shut the Government down.

There are a lot of us who are earnestly striving to do our duty, as is incumbent upon the majority, to move the business of the people while at the same time being fair to the minority. But how many times do we have to cast the same votes? Please, help us here. I plead with the President. Let's get something done. Let's deal in good faith. We don't have to let politics prevail. Because if we do, the legacy of this President and this Congress will be the words "it might have been."

It ought to be better than that. But I, for one, believe in our Republic. I believe in our separation of powers. I will be very disappointed in my leaders if we cave in to a King. We cannot do that. We are not going to cave in to a King. We need to stand up for our institution. Moreover, we need to pay attention to the details of our policy. Because if we work it out with civility, we will work it out right for the American people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I thank the Chair.

#### INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED

##### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

##### CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to calendar No. 654, S. 2507, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2001:

Trent Lott, Richard Shelby, Connie Mack, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Michael D. Crapo, Rick Santorum, Wayne Allard, Judd Gregg, Christopher Bond, Conrad Burns, Craig Thomas, Larry E. Craig, Robert F. Bennett, Orrin Hatch, Pat Roberts, and Fred Thompson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call rule has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 2507, a bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 2001 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), would vote "aye."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 96, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 228 Leg.]

##### YEAS—96

Abraham	Enzi	Lott
Akaka	Feingold	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	McCain
Baucus	Frist	McConnell
Bayh	Graham	Mikulski
Bennett	Gramm	Moynihan
Biden	Grams	Murkowski
Bingaman	Grassley	Murray
Bond	Gregg	Nickles
Boxer	Hagel	Reed
Breaux	Harkin	Reid
Brownback	Hatch	Robb
Bryan	Helms	Roberts
Bunning	Hollings	Rockefeller
Burns	Hutchinson	Roth
Byrd	Hutchison	Santorum
Campbell	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Chafee, L.	Inouye	Schumer
Cleland	Jeffords	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Smith (NH)
Conrad	Kerrey	Smith (OR)
Craig	Kerry	Snowe
Crapo	Kohl	Specter
Daschle	Kyl	Stevens
DeWine	Landrieu	Thompson
Dodd	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Domenici	Leahy	Torricelli
Dorgan	Levin	Voinovich
Durbin	Lieberman	Warner
Edwards	Lincoln	Wyden

##### NAYS—1

Gorton

NOT VOTING—2

Thomas

Wellstone

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 96, the nays are 1. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate is now in morning business.

#### EMBARGO ON CUBA

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this morning we voted on cloture on the motion to proceed to the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill. I rise to address an issue that will certainly arise in the debate. The issue is the U.S. embargo on Cuba as it relates to food and medicine.

Earlier this month, I traveled to Havana along with Senators ROBERTS and AKAKA. It was a brief trip, but it gave us an opportunity to meet with a wide range of people. We met with Cuban Cabinet Ministers and dissidents, with the head of the largest NGO in Cuba, and also with a good number of foreign ambassadors, and with President Fidel Castro himself. I might say that was a marathon 10-hour session, about half of it dining.

I left those meetings more convinced than ever that it is time to end our cold war policy towards Cuba. We should have normal trade relations with Cuba. Let me explain why.

First, this is a unilateral sanction. Nobody else in the world supports it. Not even our closest allies. Unilateral economic sanctions, don't make sense unless our national security is at stake. Forty years ago Cuba threatened our national security. The Soviet Union planted nuclear missiles in Cuba and aimed them at the United States. Twenty years ago, Cuba was still acting as a force to destabilize Central America.

Those days are gone. The missiles are gone. The Soviet Union is gone. Cuban military and guerilla forces are gone from Central America. The security threat is gone. But the embargo remains.

My reason for my opposing unilateral sanctions is entirely pragmatic. They don't work. They never worked in the past and they will not work in the future. Whenever we stop our farmers and business people from exporting, our Japanese, European, and Canadian competitors rush in to fill the gap. Unilateral sanctions are a hopelessly ineffective tool.

The second reason for ending the embargo is that the US embargo actually helps Castro.

How does it help Castro? I saw it for myself in Havana. The Cuban economy is in shambles. The people's rights are repressed. Fidel Castro blames it all on the embargo. He uses the embargo as the scapegoat for Cuba's misery. Without the embargo, he would have no one to blame.

For the past ten years I have worked towards normalizing our trade with China. My operating guideline has been "Engagement Without Illusions." Trade rules don't automatically and instantly yield trade results. We have to push hard every day to see that countries follow the rules. That's certainly the case with China.

I have the same attitude towards Cuba. Yes, we should lift the embargo. We should do it without preconditions and without demanding any quid pro quo from Cuba. We should engage them economically. But we should do so without illusions. Once we lift the embargo, Cuba will not become a major buyer of our farm goods or manufactured products overnight.

We need to be realistic. With Cuba's failed economy and low income, ending the embargo won't cause a huge surge of U.S. products to Cuba. Instead, it will start sales of some goods, such as food, medicine, some manufactures, and some telecom and Internet services.

In addition, ending the embargo will increase Cuban exposure to the United States. It will bring Cubans into contact with our tourists, business people, students, and scholars. It will bring Americans into contact with those who will be part of the post-Castro Cuba. It will spur more investment in Cuba's tourist infrastructure, helping, even if only a little, to further develop a private sector in the economy.

In May of this year, I introduced bipartisan legislation that would repeal all of the Cuba-specific statutes that create the embargo. That includes the 1992 Cuban Democracy Act and the 1996 Helms-Burton Act. I look forward to the day when that legislation will pass and we have a normal economic relationship with Cuba.

Until that day, I support measures such as this amendment which dismantle the embargo brick by brick. The sanctions on sales of food and medicine to Cuba are especially offensive.

Last year, legislation to end unilateral sanctions on food and medicine passed the Senate by a vote of 70 to 28. That legislation was hijacked by the House in conference. This year we passed similar legislation again as part of the Agriculture appropriations bill. I hope our conferees stand firm and ensure its passage this year, with one correction.

This year the sanctions provisions of the Agriculture appropriations bill contain a new requirement. The bill requires farmers who want to sell food to foreign governments of concern to get

a specific license. That is needless red tape which will make it harder to export. Last year the bill we passed had no such licensing requirement. We should strike that provision in the Agriculture appropriations conference this year.

When we begin debate on the bill, one of my colleagues will offer an amendment to address unilateral sanctions on food and medicine from a different angle. The amendment will cut off funding to enforce and administer them. The House passed a similar measure by a substantial majority. We should do the same in the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope that all of my colleagues will vote in favor of this amendment and will support the ultimate lifting of the entire Cuba trade embargo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MCCAIN. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent when Senator MCCAIN and Senator GORTON are finished, I might be recognized thereafter. Senator WYDEN is here and he has no objection. He is joining me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the consent request that after Senator MCCAIN and Senator GORTON speak—

Mr. DOMENICI. I be recognized to introduce a bill, and then that Senator WYDEN follow me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And Senator VOINOVICH after that?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCAIN and Mr. GORTON pertaining to the introduction of S. Res. 344 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI and Mr. WYDEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2937 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, following the 11:30 cloture vote the Senate proceed to consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 4576, the Defense appropriations bill. Further, I ask consent that there be up to 60 minutes for debate under the control of Senator MCCAIN and up to 15 minutes under the control of Senator GRAMM, with an additional 6 minutes equally divided between Senators STEVENS and INOUE, and 20 minutes for Senator BYRD, and